REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 19 and 26 have been amended as indicated above in accompaniment of a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. The Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on the telephone discussing the disposition of this case with Applicant's representative. During the discussion, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the cited art and some claim modifications that would receive favorable treatment by the Examiner. While Applicant believes that such modifications are unnecessary, in the spirit of advancing prosecution of this matter, Applicant has made the clarifying amendments listed above and discussed below.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,140 ("Strahorn"). Claims 19-24 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strahorn in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,747 ("Spellman").

The Claims

Claim 1 (as amended) recites a method for providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer, the method comprising:

- receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a **Web-based UI of the first computer**, the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type, **the user-interface object corresponding to a function of the first computer that is remotely operable by way of the second computer**;
- responsive to receiving the request for the context-sensitive help, the first computer:
  - determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page;
  - generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information; and
  - providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Strahorn. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection for obviousness over Strahorn does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Specifically, Strahorn fails to teach or suggest a user-interface object corresponding to a function of the first computer that is remotely operable by way of the second computer, as recited in this claim.

Specifically, Strahorn is directed to providing a miniaturized version of a Web page ("child window" 322) in which help information pertaining to content of an active Web page (304) is displayed, wherein the child window and the active Web page are simultaneously displayed (Abstract; Fig.3; Col 4., lines 8-37 of Strahorn). However, Strahorn teaches within the context of providing help related to only *information* provided within the active Web pages – Strahorn expresses no

concern whatsoever for remotely operable functions.

Specifically, Strahorn is totally lacking any teachings or suggestions directed to a Web-based UI of the first computer, in the context in which that term is used in the pending Application and claims thereof. Strahorn is concerned with help related to *information*, not *remote operations*. Applicant asserts that a Web-based user interface, in the context of the pending application, is fundamentally different in overall content, usage dynamics and purpose than the subject matter disclosed or suggested by Strahorn.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that there is no motivation or suggestion to be found in Strahorn that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the substantially different teachings of Strahorn toward the subject matter of the instant claim, as Strahorn fails to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, the Office's *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 1, as amended, fails for at least these foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-9 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 10 (as amended) recites a computer-readable storage medium comprising one or more program modules for providing context-sensitive help for a Web-based user interface (UI) of a first computer to a second computer, wherein the one or more program modules comprise computer-executable instructions:

- receiving a request for a set of context sensitive help corresponding to a **Web-based UI of the first computer**, the request being received at the first computer, the **Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object and corresponding to one or more functions of the first computer that are remotely operable by way of the second computer**, the Web-based UI being presented on the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled to the second computer over a network, the context-

sensitive help answering a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type; and

- responsive to receiving the request, the first computer:
  - generating a second Web page comprising the context-sensitive help; and
  - communicating the second Web page to the second computer for presentation.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is rendered obvious in view of Strahorn. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For reasons analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1 (as amended), the rejection for obviousness over Strahorn does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Specifically, Strahorn fails to teach or suggest a Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object and corresponding to one or more functions of the first computer that are remotely operable by way of the second computer, as recited by this claim.

Accordingly, the Office's *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 10, as amended, fails for at least these reasons.

Claims 11-16 and 18 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 19 (as amended) recites a system for providing context-sensitive help for a Web-based user interface (UI), the system comprising:

- a memory comprising a set of computer-executable instructions; and
- a processor coupled to the memory, the processor being configured to execute the computer executable instructions for:
  - communicating the **Web based UI** to a different system for presentation;
  - responsive to receiving a request for context sensitive help, determining a set of context-sensitive help that corresponds to the Web-based UI, the

Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help requesting a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" answer type, **the Web-based UI corresponding to one or more functions of the system that are remotely operable by way of the different system**;

- encapsulating the context sensitive help into a Web page that is compatible with a platform of the different system; and
- communicating the context-sensitive help embedded in the web page to the different system for presentation.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is rendered obvious by Strahorn in view of Spellman. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For reasons argued below, the rejection for obviousness over Strahorn in view of Spellman does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Specifically, Strahorn fails to teach or suggest the Web-based UI corresponding to one or more functions of the system that are remotely operable by way of the different system, as recited by this claim.

In addition, Spellman fails to cure the deficiencies of Strahorn. Specifically, Spellman fails to teach or suggest the Web-based UI corresponding to one or more functions of the system that are remotely operable by way of the different system, as recited by the subject matter of this claim. Also, Spellman fails to teach or suggest a Web based UI as recited by the subject matter of this claim.

Rather, Spellman is directed to use of a remote access macro (24) such that a user request for help within a first application program (12) results in opening help resource files (34) within a second application program (28) resident on the same computer (Abstract; Fig. 1; Col 5, line 10 to Col. 6, line 26 of Spellman). Spellman is not concerned with any Web based user interface in the context of the

pending application, nor is Spellman concerned with any sort of remotely operable functionality.

More to the point, there is no way to select particular features from Strahorn, and then to somehow combine those features with other features selected from Spellman to arrive at the subject matter of claim 19, as amended, as no possible combination of Strahorn and Spellman teaches or suggests all of the required features.

Accordingly, the Office's *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 19, as amended, fails for at least these reasons.

Claims 20-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 26 (as amended) recites a user interface embodied in a computer-readable storage medium for providing context-sensitive help for a remote user interface (UI), the user interface comprising:

- a first area in a web page for displaying, on a first device, **a remote UI that corresponds to a second device**, the remote UI comprising a user-interface object and corresponding to **at least one function of the second device that is remotely operable by way of the first device**; and
- a second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help to answer a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is rendered obvious by Strahorn in view of Spellman. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For reasons analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 19 (as amended), the rejection for

obviousness over Strahorn in view of Spellman does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Specifically, neither Strahorn nor Spellman teaches or suggests a ***remote*** UI that corresponds to a second device, as recited by this claim. Furthermore, neither Strahorn nor Spellman teaches or suggests at least one function of the second device that is remotely operable by way of the first device, as recited by the subject matter of this claim.

There is no way to select particular features from Strahorn, and then to somehow combine those features with other features selected from Spellman to arrive at the subject matter of claim 26, as amended, as no possible combination of Strahorn and Spellman teaches or suggests all of the required features.

Accordingly, the Office's *prima facie* case of obviousness against claim 26, as amended, fails for at least these reasons.

Claims 27-31 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/30/06

By: _____

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256